

Remarks

In the Office Action mailed 25 February 2003, the Examiner notes that the information disclosure statement filed 9 November 2001 does not include legible copies of documents 3-9. Legible copies of the documents are supplied herewith for the Examiner's consideration.

In the Office Action, the Examiner objects to claims 7 and 9 for informalities. The informalities are addressed in the amended claims.


In the Office Action, claims 1-11 and 14 are rejected under 35 USC 112 second paragraph as being indefinite. The Examiner states that claims 1-5 and claims 6-11 are indefinite because the claims do not make clear whether performance of the final step in the claimed method, performing electrophoresis, is sufficient to meet the requirements of the claims. The Examiner also rejects claim 14 because the claim does not make clear whether performance of the final step in the claimed method is sufficient to meet the requirements of the claim. The Examiner requests clarification.

Claims 1, 6 and 14 have been clarified by amendment to indicate the final step of the claimed method is determining the sequence. Use of the term "amplified fragment" in claims 6 and 14, referring to a fragment of the amplified and digested nucleic acid, has been amended to clarify the meaning of the claim language.

Claims 1-11 and 14 are also rejected as being indefinite for use of unclear antecedents and the use of limitations for which there is insufficient antecedent basis. The Applicants have amended the claims to overcome these rejections.

Applicants respectfully submit that the claims as amended are in condition for allowance and request favorable reconsideration.

Respectfully Submitted,


Michael M. Conger
Registration No. 43,502

Date: December 2, 2003
GlaxoSmithKline
5 Moore Drive, P.O. Box 13398
Research Triangle Park, NC 27709
Tel: (919) 483-2474; Fax: (919) 483-7988